

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

7 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

8 \* \* \*

9 The Board Of Trustees Of The Construction  
10 Industry And Laborers Health And Welfare  
Trust, *et al.*,

11 Plaintiffs,

12 v.

13 FF&E Logistical, Inc., *et al.*,

14 Defendants.  
15

Case No. 2:16-cv-01289-RFB-NJK

**ORDER**

16 Before the Court for consideration is the Report and Recommendation [ECF No. 20] of the  
17 Honorable Nancy J. Koppe, United States Magistrate Judge, entered March 24, 2017.

18 A district court “may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or  
19 recommendations made by the magistrate.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). A party may file specific  
20 written objections to the findings and recommendations of a magistrate judge. 28 U.S.C. §  
21 636(b)(1); Local Rule IB 3-2(a). When written objections have been filed, the district court is  
22 required to “make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed  
23 findings or recommendations to which objection is made.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); see also Local  
24 Rule IB 3-2(b). Where a party fails to object, however, a district court is not required to conduct  
25 “any review,” de novo or otherwise, of the report and recommendations of a magistrate judge.  
26 Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985). Pursuant to Local Rule IB 3-2(a), objections were due  
27 by April 7, 2017. No objections have been filed. The Court has reviewed the record in this case  
28 and concurs with the Magistrate Judge’s recommendations.

